



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/599,950	06/23/2000	Pawel Rej	169.1753	8958

5514 7590 03/06/2006

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO  
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA  
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

SINGH, RACHNA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 03/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/599,950

Applicant(s)

REJ, PAWEL

Examiner

Rachna Singh

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-7,9-15,17-19 and 21-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-7,9-15,17-19 and 21-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment and Arguments filed 12/15/06.
2. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-15, 17-19, and 21-26 are pending. Claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 25, and 26 are independent claims.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-15, 17-19, and 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kothuri et al., US 6,505,205, 01/2003 (filed 1/3/02, continuation 5/29/99).

In reference to claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 25, and 26, Kothuri teaches a method of creating a split tree from a set of multi-dimensional data items. Kothuri's system comprises the following steps:

-Taking a set of multi-dimensional data items by recursively dividing the data items into smaller clusters until each cluster can be stored in a single leaf node of a hierarchical (tree-structured) index. If a set of data items or a subset thereof is too large to fit in a single leaf node, a suitable dimension attribute in which to divide the data items is selected. Compare to ***"determining which of a plurality of nodes fit into a target area"***. See column 3, lines 30-40.

-Determining whether the number of data items is greater than the node capacity. See figure 5. Compare to ***“setting one of the plurality of nodes as a current node for said galley target; comparing the size of the current node with available space in the target area”***.

-If the node capacity is not greater than the number of data items, then clustering the data items into separate leaf nodes. See figure 5. Compare to ***“if the size of the current node is not greater. . .fits into the target area”***

-If the node capacity is greater than the number of data items, then determining the variance in each data dimension, selecting the data dimension with the greatest variance, sorting data items in the selected dimension, dividing data into two or more subsets, calculating the number of data items in each subset and determining if the data items in any subset is greater than the node capacity. If it is not greater, clustering the data items into separate leaf nodes. If it is greater then selected a subset having more data items than the node capacity and repeated the steps of determining the variance . . . calculating the number of data items in each subset again. See figure 5. Compare to ***“if the size of the current node is greater. . .sub-steps of: determining whether the current node is a parent node, setting one . . .at least one child node; and recursively executing steps (a2) to (a4) with respect to the new current node”***.

Kothuri does not state ***“marking the nodes that fit into the target area with a common mark specific to the target area such that a section of the input tree that fits into the target area is defined while preserving the structure of the input tree”***; however, Kothuri does teach that the first object in a database where the R-tree index is

stored is configured to store information concerning the index (its dimensionality, fanout) and an identifier (an address, unique node identity) of a root node of the index. Kothuri also teaches that the second object can consist of a unique identifier of the corresponding node, an identifier of the parent node, sibling node, and a measure of the number of children in the node. See column 3-4. These identifiers are similar to the claimed "marks" as they are specific to the galley target and are used to create a split tree. See column 22, figure 5, and columns 24-25. A "mark" is simply a means for identification of those nodes that are to be split. Kothuri teaches whenever a node, node1, splits into two nodes, node1 and node1' the Node\_id of node1 before the split is assigned to node1'. Node 1 then receives a new Node-id generated by the Node\_id generator. Second, when the tree is traversed during an update operation (e.g. addition or deletion), the node Node\_id is also saved for each node that is added to the update path. Third, when a root node such as nodeR splits into nodeR and nodeR', a new root, nodes, is created with entries for nodeR and nodeR'. These safeguards help maintain the integrity of the index, if a node is split. See column 22, lines 14-39. In generating a new node\_id for the original node (or root node), the R-tree index is maintained and preserved. Furthermore, Kothuri discloses storing the R-tree index in a database such that it receives the benefit of security, concurrency control, backup and recovery. See column 8, lines 30-40. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to recognize that in splitting a node into two nodes and marking them with a id generated by the node\_id generator provides a means to mark nodes that fit into a certain target area and furthermore, that

maintaining the integrity of the R-tree index would preserve its structure. Compare to ***“marking the nodes that fit into the target area with a common mark specific to the target area such that a section of the input tree that fits into the target area is defined while preserving the structure of the input tree”***.

In reference to claim 2, 14, and 22, Kothuri does not teach checking to see if a start node has been marked; however, he does teach associating an identifier indicating a unique node identity of the root node. See column 3. The information also indicates the fanout and dimensionality of the node, thus indicating whether there is a child node. Furthermore, Kothuri teaches that the second object can consist of a unique identifier of the corresponding node, an identifier of the parent node, sibling node, and a measure of the number of children in the node. See column 3-4. These identifiers are similar to the claimed “marks” as they are specific to the galley target and are used to create a split tree. See column 22, figure 5, and columns 24-25.

In reference to claim 9, Kothuri teaches that the first object in a database where the R-tree index) is stored is configured to store information concerning the index (its dimensionality, fanout) and an identifier (an address, unique node identity) of a root node of the index. Kothuri also teaches that the second object can consist of a unique identifier of the corresponding node, an identifier of the parent node, sibling node, and a measure of the number of children in the node. These identifiers are similar to the claimed “marks” as they are specific to the galley target and are used to create a split tree. See column 22, figure 5, and columns 24-25. Since Kothuri teaches uses an identifier for the nodes in the galley target, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to “mark” the nodes as a mark is simply a means for identification which is disclosed by Kothuri. Kothuri further teaches that if a leaf node is chosen to receive a new data item that would exceed its capacity, there are two or more subsets created where data items are clustered into separate leaf nodes.

In reference to claims 3 and 15, Kothuri teaches that update operations traverse an R-tree to carry out the addition/removal of data items and the R-tree index is updated to reflect any modifications. See column 16, lines 5-16.

In reference to claims 5, 10-11, 17, and 23, Kothuri teaches that the first object in a database where the R-tree index) is stored is configured to store information concerning the index (its dimensionality, fanout) and an identifier (an address, unique node identity) of a root node of the index. Kothuri also teaches that the second object can consist of a unique identifier of the corresponding node, an identifier of the parent node, sibling node, and a measure of the number of children in the node. These identifiers are similar to the claimed “marks” as they are specific to the galley target and are used to create a split tree. See column 22, figure 5, and columns 24-25. Since Kothuri teaches uses an identifier for the nodes in the galley target, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to “mark” the nodes as a mark is simply a means for identification which is disclosed by Kothuri. Kothuri further teaches that if a leaf node is chosen to receive a new data item that would exceed its capacity, there are two or more subsets created where data items are clustered into separate leaf nodes.

In reference to claims 6 and 18, Kothuri teaches that the root node has an identifier that indicates the dimensionality and fanout of that node. See column 3.

In reference to claims 12 and 24, Kothuri teaches that the first object in a database where the R-tree index) is stored is configured to store information concerning the index (its dimensionality, fanout) and an identifier (an address, unique node identity) of a root node of the index. Kothuri also teaches that the second object can consist of a unique identifier of the corresponding node, an identifier of the parent node, sibling node, and a measure of the number of children in the node. These identifiers are similar to the claimed "marks" as they are specific to the galley target and are used to create a split tree. See column 22, figure 5, and columns 24-25. Kothuri further teaches that if a leaf node is chosen to receive a new data item that would exceed its capacity, there are two or more subsets created where data items are clustered into separate leaf nodes. Kothuri teaches whenever a node, node1, splits into two nodes, node1 and node1' the Node\_id of node1 before the split is assigned to node1'. Node 1 then receives a new Node-id generated by the Node\_id generator. Second, when the tree is traversed during an update operation (e.g. addition or deletion), the node Node\_id is also saved for each node that is added to the update path. Third, when a root node such as nodeR splits into nodeR and nodeR', a new root, nodes, is created with entries for nodeR and nodeR'. These safeguards help maintain the integrity of the index, if a node is split. See column 22, lines 14-39. In generating a new node\_id for the original node (or root node), the R-tree index is maintained and preserved. Furthermore, Kothuri discloses storing the R-tree index in a database such that it



receives the benefit of security, concurrency control, backup and recovery. See column 8, lines 30-40. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to recognize that in splitting a node into two nodes and marking them with a id generated by the node\_id generator provides a means to mark nodes that fit into a certain target area and furthermore, that maintaining the integrity of the R-tree index would preserve its structure.

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-15, 17-19, and 21-26 have been considered but are not persuasive.

With respect to claims 1, 7, 13, 19, and 25-26, Applicant argues the feature of ***“marking the nodes that fit into the target area with a common mark specific to the target area such that a section of the input tree that fits into the target area is defined while preserving the structure of the input tree”*** is not taught by Kothuri. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Kothuri does teach that the first object in a database where the R-tree index is stored is configured to store information concerning the index (its dimensionality, fanout) and an identifier (an address, unique node identity) of a root node of the index. Kothuri also teaches that the second object can consist of a unique identifier of the corresponding node, an identifier of the parent node, sibling node, and a measure of the number of children in the node. See column 3-4. These identifiers are similar to the claimed “marks” as they are specific to the galley target and are used to create a split tree. See column 22, figure 5, and columns 24-25. A “mark” is simply a means for identification of those nodes that are to be split. Kothuri teaches whenever a

node, node1, splits into two nodes, node1 and node1' the Node\_id of node1 before the split is assigned to node1'. Node 1 then receives a new Node-id generated by the Node\_id generator. Second, when the tree is traversed during an update operation (e.g. addition or deletion), the node Node\_id is also saved for each node that is added to the update path. Third, when a root node such as nodeR splits into nodeR and nodeR', a new root, nodes, is created with entries for nodeR and nodeR'. These safeguards help maintain the integrity of the index, if a node is split. See column 22, lines 14-39. In generating a new node\_id for the original node (or root node), the R-tree index is maintained and preserved. Furthermore, Kothuri discloses storing the R-tree index in a database such that it receives the benefit of security, concurrency control, backup and recovery. See column 8, lines 30-40. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to recognize that in splitting a node into two nodes and marking them with a id generated by the node\_id generator provides a means to mark nodes that fit into a certain target area and furthermore, that maintaining the integrity of the R-tree index would preserve its structure.

In view of the comments above, the rejection is maintained.

### ***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rachna Singh whose telephone number is 571-272-4099. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30AM-6:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 09/599,950

Page 11

Art Unit: 2176

RS

03/02/06

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Doug Hutton', with a stylized, cursive script.

Doug Hutton  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2176